	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/009,980	BENEDI BENITO ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Teresa E. Strzelecka	1637
All Participants:	Status of Application: Pe	<u>ending</u>
(1) <u>Teresa E. Strzelecka</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Edward Gamson</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 August 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	licant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a writ te record of the substance of the	tten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
Teera Strelectia		
	ant/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examinar Initiated Intension Summa	itiated Intensions Summans	BENEDI BENITO ET AL.
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summa	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Teresa E. Strzelecka	1637
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>Pending</u>
(1) <u>Teresa E. Strzelecka</u> .	(3)	
(2) Edward Gamson.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 September 2005	Time:	•
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ N If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 18 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Mr. Gamson received an approval from the Applicants for Examiner's amendment, putting the application in conditions.	or the proposed changes to claim 18,	
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se directly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief section of all issues. 	tion. The examiner will provide a parate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
Teres a Stuelectiq		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

à

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gamson was contacted to discuss patentability of the amended claim 18.. The last step of the claim is drawn to amplification of extracted gum DNA using one or more primers of SEQ ID NO: 4, SEQ ID NO: 6, a portion of SEQ ID NO: 7 or a portion of SEQ ID NO:9. As evidenced by sequence search, SEQ ID NO: 4 is not specific to guar plants, as are most of the fragments of SEQ ID NO: 7 and 9. The only primers specific for guar rRNA amplification are primers with SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6, denoted as PG21 and PG22 in Fig. 1A. Therefore, for claim 18 to be allowable it would need to be drawn to primers comprising SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6. Another issue with claim 18 is lack of correspondence between the preamble and the final method step. Mr. Gamson said he would contact the Applicants to find out if they agreed to the proposed amendments.